arXiv:0910.0978v1 [math.AP] 6 Oct 2009

STABILITY OF SOLITARY WAVES FOR THREE COUPLED LONG WAVE - SHORT WAVE INTERACTION EQUATIONS

Handan Borluk* and Saadet Erbay†

Department of Mathematics, Isik University, 34980 Sile-Istanbul, Turkey

October 6, 2009

Abstract

In this paper we consider a three-component system of one dimensional long wave-short wave interaction equations. The system has two-parameter family of solitary wave solutions. We prove orbital stability of the solitary wave solutions using variational methods.

MSC: 35B35, 35Q55

Keywords: Long wave-short wave interaction equations, orbital stability of solitary waves.

---

*e-mail: hborluk@isikun.edu.tr

†e-mail: serbay@isikun.edu.tr

1 Introduction

In the present paper, we study orbital stability of solitary wave solutions for the three coupled long wave-short wave interaction (LSI) equations

$$\left.\begin{aligned} &i\phi_t + \phi_{xx} = \beta w\phi, \\ &i\psi_t + \psi_{xx} = \beta w\psi, \\ &w_t = \beta(|\phi|^2 + |\psi|^2)_x, \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{1.1}$$

where $\phi, \psi : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{C},\ w : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}$, β is a real constant. Here w represents a long wave mode, and ϕ and ψ denote short wave modes propagating in a continuous medium. This system describes the resonant interaction among two short wave modes with equal group speeds and one long wave mode whose phase speed is equal to the group speed of short waves. System (1.1) appears, for instance, in water waves [1, 2] and in a bulk elastic medium [3]. In a recent study [4], it is shown that system (1.1) has a two-parameter family of solitary wave solutions of the form

$$\left.\begin{aligned} &\phi_s(x,t) = \Phi(x-ct)e^{i\omega t}, \\ &\psi_s(x,t) = \Psi(x-ct)e^{i\omega t}, \\ &w_s(x,t) = W(x-ct), \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{1.2}$$

where $W(x) = -\beta(|\Phi(x)|^2 + |\Psi(x)|^2)/c,\ \ (\Phi(x), \Psi(x)) = (R_1(x), R_2(x))e^{\frac{icx}{2}}$, $c > 0$ and $4\omega - c^2 > 0$. Here $W \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and $(R_1, R_2) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R})$ are positive solutions of

$$\left.\begin{aligned} &-u_{xx} + (\omega - \frac{c^2}{4})u - \frac{\beta^2}{c}(u^2 + v^2)u = 0, \\ &-v_{xx} + (\omega - \frac{c^2}{4})v - \frac{\beta^2}{c}(u^2 + v^2)v = 0. \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{1.3}$$

System (1.1) is a generalization of the two component long wave-short wave interaction system given by

$$\left.\begin{aligned} &i\phi_t + \phi_{xx} = \beta w\phi, \\ &w_t = \nu(|\phi|^2)_x. \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{1.4}$$

System (1.4) was derived to describe the resonant interaction of a short wave, ϕ, and a long wave, w, propagating on the surface of water [5]. The same system was also obtained for the resonant interaction of internal gravity waves [6]. In [7], orbital stability of solitary wave solutions of the two component system (1.4) was considered and it was observed that the solitary waves of the form

$$\phi(x,t) = R(x-ct)\; e^{i\omega t + i\frac{c}{2}(x-ct)}, \quad w(x,t) = W(x-ct),$$

where $(R,W) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times L^2(\mathbb{R})$, are orbitally stable when $c > 0$ and $4\omega - c^2 > 0$. In that study, a Lyapunov functional, whose critical point is the solitary wave solution of (1.4), was constructed using the conserved quantities of the system. It was shown that the stability of solitary waves relied on suitable lower and upper bounds on the variation of the Lyapunov functional. This method has been developed in [8] to prove the stability of solitary waves of the Korteweg -de Vries equation. In a later study [9], the same method has been used to show the stability of standing waves of the Nonlinear Schrödinger equation, which has been already proved in [10] using the concentration-compactness methods. In the present paper, we prove that solitary waves (1.2) are orbitally stable for the LSI system (1.1) when $c > 0$ and $4\omega - c^2 > 0$, using a variational method, the so-called Lyapunov method.

The organization of the paper is as follows: The local well-posedness of the Cauchy problem for (1.1) is discussed, and conserved integrals for the same system is given in section 2. A variational characterization of the solitary waves, which will be used in the proof of the stability of solitary wave solutions, is briefly presented in section 3. We state the stability theorem that relies on a lower bound of the second variation of the Lyapunov functional in section 4. Using the analysis of the unconstrained variational problem carried out in [4], the lower bound is proved and the stability of solitary waves is established in the same section.

Notations. Throughout the paper $L^p(\mathbb{R}),\ 1 \le p < \infty$, represents the space of $p-$integrable functions. $\|f\|_p$ denotes the $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ norm of $f,\ 1 \le p \le \infty$. $H^1(\mathbb{R}) = W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R})$ is the Sobolev space of f for which the norm $\|f\|_{H^1}^2 = \|f\|_2^2 + \|\nabla f\|_2^2$ is finite. $\langle f, g\rangle$ refers to the inner product of f and g in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$.

2 Local Well-Posedness of Cauchy Problem

The Cauchy problem for the two component LSI system (1.4) was studied in [11] for initial data $(\phi_0, w_0) \in H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}) \times L^2(\mathbb{R})$. A contraction technique was used to prove existence and uniqueness of solutions of the initial value problem in suitable Banach spaces. Conservation of energy and masses were used to extend the local solution globally. Later, the local-well-posedness result for (1.4) was improved in [12] for initial data $(\phi_0, w_0) \in H^k(\mathbb{R}) \times L^{1/k}(\mathbb{R}), \quad 0 < k < 1/2$. The Cauchy problem for the three component LSI system (1.1) was considered in [13] for initial data $(\phi_0, \psi_0, w_0) \in H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}) \times H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}) \times L^2(\mathbb{R})$. Following the ideas of [11], the local-well-posedness theory was established in the same study. In the present section, the local well-posedness of the Cauchy problem for (1.1), which is necessary in the study of stability of solitary waves, will be presented briefly.

For the three component LSI system, the Cauchy problem

$$\left.\begin{aligned} &i\phi_t + \phi_{xx} = F_\phi(\phi, \psi) \\ &i\psi_t + \psi_{xx} = F_\psi(\phi, \psi) \\ &\phi(x,0) = \phi_0(x), \quad \psi(x,0) = \psi_0(x) \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{2.1}$$

was considered in [13], where

$$(F_\phi, F_\psi) = \left(\beta^2 \int_0^t (|\phi(x,s)|^2 + |\psi(x,s)|^2)_x ds + \beta w_0(x)\right) (\phi(x,t), \psi(x,t)).$$

Here $(\phi_0, \psi_0, w_0) \in H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}) \times H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R}) \times L^2(\mathbb{R})$. Following [11], a fixed point method was used to prove existence and uniqueness of local in time solutions. First, the Cauchy problem (2.1) was written as a coupled system of integral equations

$$\left.\begin{aligned} \phi(t) = J_1(\phi, \psi) = U(t)\phi_0(x) - i\int_0^t U(t-s) F_\phi(\phi(s), \psi(s)) ds \\ \psi(t) = J_2(\phi, \psi) = U(t)\psi_0(x) - i\int_0^t U(t-s) F_\psi(\phi(s), \psi(s)) ds, \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{2.2}$$

where $U(t) = e^{it\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}}$ is the Schrödinger linear group. Similar to that of [11], the function space X^T was defined by

$$X^T = \{f : [0,T] \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathrm{C} | f \in C([0,T]; H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R})),\ f_x \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}; L^2[0,T])\},$$

and endowed with the norm

$$\|f\|_{X^T} = \sup_{0\le t\le T} \|f(.,t)\|_{H^{1/2}} + \sup_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\int_0^T |f_x(x,t)|^2 dt \right)^{1/2}.$$

Thus $(\phi,\psi) \in Y^T = X^T \times X^T$ for which the norm was defined as

$$\|(\phi,\psi)\|_{Y^T} = \|\phi\|_{X^T} + \|\psi\|_{X^T}. \tag{2.3}$$

A ball of radius $R > 0$ was defined as $B_R = \{(\phi,\psi) \in Y^T : \|\phi\|_{X^T} + \|\psi\|_{X^T} \le R\}$. Using smoothing effects estimates (Lemmas 1-3 in [11]) obtained in [14, 15] and Lemmas 4-5 in [11], the norm of $\Psi(\phi,\psi) = (J_1, J_2)$ in Y^T was calculated to show $\Psi : B_R \to B_R$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Psi(\phi,\psi)\|_{Y^T} &= \|J_1(\phi,\psi)\|_{X^T} + \|J_2(\phi,\psi)\|_{X^T} \\ &\le C_1\|\phi_0\|_{H^{1/2}} + C_2\|\psi_0\|_{H^{1/2}} + K_1(T)(\|\phi\|^2_{X^T} \\ &\quad + \|\psi\|^2_{X^T} + 1)\|\phi\|_{X^T} + K_2(T)(\|\phi\|^2_{X^T} + \|\psi\|^2_{X^T} + 1)\|\psi\|_{X^T} \\ &\le C(\|\phi_0\|_{H^{1/2}} + \|\psi_0\|_{H^{1/2}}) \\ &\quad + K(T)(\|\phi\|^2_{X^T} + \|\psi\|^2_{X^T} + 1)(\|\phi\|_{X^T} + \|\psi\|_{X^T}). \end{aligned}$$

Here $C = \max\{C_1, C_2\}$ is a positive constant, $K(T) = \max\{K_1(T), K_2(T)\}$ and $K(T) \to 0$ as $T \to 0$. R was chosen so as to $C(\|\phi_0\|_{H^{1/2}} + \|\psi_0\|_{H^{1/2}}) \le R/2$. Then for fixed $R > 0$, small T was taken to ensure $K(T)(4R^3 + 2R) < R/2$. This led to

$$\|\Psi(\phi,\psi)\|_{Y^T} \le R.$$

For uniqueness of the fixed point, in a similar way, the norm of $\Psi(\phi_1,\psi_1)(t) - \Psi(\phi_2,\psi_2)(t)$ in Y^T

was calculated:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\Psi(\phi_1,\psi_1)(t)-\Psi(\phi_2,\psi_2)(t)\|_{Y^T} &= \|J_1(\phi_1,\psi_1)-J_1(\phi_2,\psi_2)\|_{X^T} \\
&+\|J_2(\phi_1,\psi_1)-J_2(\phi_2,\psi_2)\|_{X^T} \\
&\leq H_1(T)\left(\|\phi_1\|^2_{X^T}+\|\phi_2\|^2_{X^T}+\|\psi_1\|^2_{X^T}\right. \\
&\left.+\|\psi_2\|^2_{X^T}+1\right)\|\phi_1-\phi_2\|_{X^T} \\
&+H_2(T)\left(\|\psi_1\|^2_{X^T}+\|\psi_2\|^2_{X^T}+\|\phi_1\|^2_{X^T}\right. \\
&\left.+\|\phi_2\|^2_{X^T}+1\right)\|\psi_1-\psi_2\|_{X^T} \\
&\leq H(T)(4R^2+1)\|(\phi_1-\phi_2,\psi_1-\psi_2)\|_{Y^T},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $H(T)=\max\{H_1(T),H_2(T)\}$ and $H(T)\to 0$ as $T\to 0$. T was chosen as a small quantity so that $H(T)(4R^2+1)<1$. It was concluded in [13] that $\Psi(\phi,\psi)$ was a contraction on B_R and (ϕ,ψ) was the unique solution of (2.2), i.e. the local well-posedness of the Cauchy problem for (1.1) was established:

Theorem Let $(\phi_0,\psi_0)\in H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R})\times H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R})$ and $w_0\in L^2(\mathbb{R})\cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. There exists a unique solution $(\phi(x,t),\psi(x,t))$ of the Cauchy problem (2.1) on $[0,T]$ for $T>0$ such that $\phi\in C\left([0,T];H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R})\right)$, $\phi_x\in L^\infty\left(\mathbb{R};L^2[0,T]\right)$, $\psi\in C\left([0,T];H^{1/2}(\mathbb{R})\right)$ and $\psi_x\in L^\infty\left(\mathbb{R};L^2[0,T]\right)$.

The conserved integrals of the LSI system (1.1) are of the form [16]

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_1 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\phi|^2\ dx, \qquad I_2=\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\psi|^2\ dx, \\
I_3 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[w^2+i(\phi^*\phi_x-\phi\phi_x^*+\psi^*\psi_x-\psi\psi_x^*)\right]\ dx, \\
I_4 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[|\phi_x|^2+|\psi_x|^2+\beta(|\phi|^2+|\psi|^2)w\right]\ dx,
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.4}
$$

where I_1 and I_2 are the mass functionals, I_3 is the momentum functional and I_4 is the energy functional, i.e. the Hamiltonian. As the natural energy space for the LSI system (1.1) is $H^1(\mathbb{R})\times H^1(\mathbb{R})\times L^2(\mathbb{R})$, the initial data is taken as $(\phi_0,\psi_0,w_0)\in H^1(\mathbb{R})\times H^1(\mathbb{R})\times L^2(\mathbb{R})$ in the present study.

3 Variational Characterization of Solitary Waves

In this section we briefly discuss a variational characterization of solutions for (1.3), considered in [4], where the stability analysis of solitary waves is based on.

Motivated by Nagy inequality [17] given as

$$\left(\frac{s}{2}H(\frac{s}{\beta},\frac{p-1}{p})\right)^{-\frac{\beta}{s}} \leq \frac{\|u_x\|_p^{\frac{\beta}{s}}\ \|u\|_q^{q+\beta\frac{q(p-1)}{ps}}}{\|u\|_{q+\beta}^{q+\beta}}, \quad u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}), \tag{3.1}$$

where $q, \beta > 0,\ p \geq 1$, $s = 1 + q(p-1)/p$, $H(a,b) = [(a+b)^{-(a+b)}\Gamma(1+a+b)]/[a^{-a}b^{-b}\Gamma(1+a)\Gamma(1+b)]$ and Γ is the Gamma function, and by Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality

$$\|u\|_r \leq C\ \|\nabla u\|_2^{\vartheta}\ \|u\|_2^{1-\vartheta}, \quad 0 < \vartheta \leq 1, \quad u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

where $\vartheta = n(1/2 - 1/r)$; the nonlinear functional $J(u,v)$ on $H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R})$

$$J(u,v) = \frac{(\|u\|_2^2 + \|v\|_2^2)^{1-\theta/2}(\|u_x\|_2^2 + \|v_x\|_2^2)^{\theta/2}}{\|u^2+v^2\|_2^{1/2}}, \quad \theta = \frac{1}{4}, \tag{3.2}$$

was considered in [4]. The functional $J(u,v)$ is well defined on $H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R})$ due to embedding of $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ in $L^4(\mathbb{R})$. It should be pointed out that the nonlinear functional $J(u,v)$ is a generalization of the single variable functional $J(u)$ which was considered in the study of standing waves of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation [18].

The first variation of the nonlinear functional $J(u,v)$ is given as

$$\delta J = -B \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} \left\{[u_{xx} - \Omega u + \gamma(u^2+v^2)u]\eta_1 + [v_{xx} - \Omega v + \gamma(u^2+v^2)v]\eta_2\right\} dx,$$

where $\eta_i \in C_0^{\infty}(\mathbb{R})$ $(i = 1,2)$, $\Omega = \omega - c^2/4$ and $\gamma = \beta^2/c$, $B = [3^3/(4^4\Omega^3\gamma^4(\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}}(u^2+v^2)^2dx)^6))]^{1/8}$, and the Pohozaev type identities,

$$3\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}}(u_x^2+v_x^2)dx = \Omega\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}}(u^2+v^2)dx = \frac{3\gamma}{4}\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}}(u^2+v^2)^2dx, \tag{3.3}$$

satisfied by (u,v) are used. It is shown in [4] that the infimum of $J(u,v)$ is achieved at a pair of positive functions (R_1,R_2) when $c > 0$ and $4\omega - c^2 > 0$ using Lieb's compactness lemma. Thus the critical points of the functional $J(u,v)$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R})$ are the non-trivial weak solutions of (1.3). As will be seen in section 4, the variational characterization plays a key role in the stability analysis of solitary waves (1.2).

It should be noted that there are various studies in the literature devoted to the problem of existence of solutions of the coupled system (1.3) and its generalizations ([19, 20] and the references therein). In those studies, variational approaches based on minimization of energy functionals subject to some constraints are used. Though the approach followed in [4] is different from those of [19, 20], it is readily seen that minimizing the energy functional is equivalent to minimizing the nonlinear functional $J(u,v)$. Indeed, the energy functional for solitary waves

$$I_4(u,v)=\int_{\mathbb{R}}\left(u_x^2+v_x^2+\frac{c^2}{4}(u^2+v^2)-\gamma(u^2+v^2)^2\right)dx,$$

after the scale transformation $(u_q(x),v_q(x))=\sqrt{q}(u(qx),v(qx))$ with $q>0$, takes the form

$$\begin{aligned}I_4(u,v)\geq\inf_{q>0}I_4(u_q,v_q)&=\inf_{q>0}\int_{\mathbb{R}}[q^2(u_x^2+v_x^2)+\frac{c^2}{4}(u^2+v^2)-\gamma q(u^2+v^2)^2\ ]dx,\\ &\geq\int_{\mathbb{R}}\left(q^2(u_x^2+v_x^2)-\gamma q(u^2+v^2)^2\right)dx,\end{aligned}\tag{3.4}$$

where the conserved mass integrals do not change: $\|u_q\|_2=\|u\|_2$ and $\|v_q\|_2=\|v\|_2$. Using the scaled forms of the identities (3.3) in (3.4), the energy functional takes the form

$$I_4(u,v)\geq\inf_{q>0}I_4(u_q,v_q)\geq-\left(\frac{3\gamma^2\Omega^7}{16}\right)^{1/8}\lambda^{5/4}\frac{1}{\inf J(u,v)},$$

for which $J(u_q,v_q)=J(u,v)$ and $\lambda=I_1+I_2$. Thus ground state solutions (u_q,v_q), i.e. a minimizer of the Hamiltonian I_4, is also a minimizer of the functional $J(u,v)$.

4 Stability of Solitary Waves

In this section, we are concerned with the stability of solitary wave solutions (1.2) of system (1.1). For solitary waves, the appropriate notion of stability is orbital stability. All solitary waves of the same form but in different positions through space translation and phase rotation are assumed to be in the same orbit. The LSI equations have translation and phase symmetries, i.e. if $(\phi(x,t),\psi(x,t),w(x,t))$ solves the LSI equations, then $(e^{i\theta_1}\phi(x+x_0,t),\ e^{i\theta_2}\psi(x+x_0,t),\ w(x+x_0,t))$ solves the same system for any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in [0,\, 2\pi)$. We define the orbit $\mathcal{O}(f,g,h)$ of the triplet (f,g,h) as follows:

$$\mathcal{O}(f,g,h) = \{e^{i\theta_1} f(.+x_0), e^{i\theta_2} g(.+x_0), h(.+x_0);\ \theta_1, \theta_2 \in [0,\, 2\pi),\ x_0 \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

A solitary wave is said to be *orbitally stable* if, for the initial data being near the solitary wave orbit, the solution at all later times remains near the solitary wave orbit.

The main result of this section is the following theorem.

Theorem 1. For $c > 0$ and $4\omega - c^2 > 0$, solitary wave solution of (1.1)

$$\left.\begin{aligned} &e^{i\omega t}\Phi(x-ct) = e^{i\omega t} R_1(x-ct) e^{i\frac{c(x-ct)}{2}}, \\ &e^{i\omega t}\Psi(x-ct) = e^{i\omega t} R_2(x-ct) e^{i\frac{c(x-ct)}{2}}, \\ &W(x-ct) = -\frac{\beta}{c}[R_1^2(x-ct) + R_2^2(x-ct)], \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{4.1}$$

is orbitally stable, i.e. for any $\epsilon \geq 0$ there exists a corresponding $\delta \geq 0$ such that the initial data $(\phi_0, \psi_0, w_0) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times L^2(\mathbb{R})$ with

$$\|\phi_0(.) - \Phi(.)\|_{H^1} \leq \delta, \quad \|\psi_0(.) - \Psi(.)\|_{H^1} \leq \delta, \quad \|w_0(.) - W(.)\|_2 \leq \delta,$$

imply

$$\begin{aligned} &\inf_{\substack{x_0\in\mathbb{R} \\ \theta_1\in[0,2\pi)}} \|e^{i\theta_1}\phi(.+x_0,t) - \Phi(.)\|_{H^1} \leq \epsilon, \\ &\inf_{\substack{x_0\in\mathbb{R} \\ \theta_2\in[0,2\pi)}} \|e^{i\theta_2}\psi(.+x_0,t) - \Psi(.)\|_{H^1} \leq \epsilon, \\ &\inf_{x_0\in\mathbb{R}} \|w(.+x_0,t) - W(.)\|_2 \leq \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

In order to show that solitary waves (4.1) are orbitally stable, i.e. to prove Theorem 1; we have to find an estimate on the distance in $H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R})$ between the orbit $\mathcal{O}_{(R_1,R_2)}$ of solitary waves and the solution $(\phi(x,t), \psi(x,t))$ of the LSI system. The deviation of the solution $(\phi(x,t), \psi(x,t))$ corresponding to the initial data (ϕ_0, ψ_0) from the orbit $\mathcal{O}_{(R_1,R_2)}$ of solitary waves is measured by the metric

$$\rho_\Omega^2[(\phi,\psi), \mathcal{O}_{(R_1,R_2)}] = \inf_{\substack{x_0\in\mathbb{R} \\ \theta_1,\theta_2\in[0,2\pi)}} \{I_\Omega\},$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_\Omega(x_0,\theta_1,\theta_2) &= N_\Omega(e^{i\theta_1}e^{-i\frac{c}{2}(.+x_0-ct)}\phi(.+x_0,t)-R_1) \\
&+ N_\Omega(e^{i\theta_2}e^{-i\frac{c}{2}(.+x_0-ct)}\psi(.+x_0,t)-R_2). \qquad (4.2)
\end{aligned}
$$

The norm function N_Ω in (4.2) is defined as $N_\Omega(f)=\Omega\|f\|_2^2+\|\nabla f\|_2^2$ and satisfies $\min(1,\Omega)\ \|f\|_{H^1}^2\le N_\Omega(f)\le\max(1,\Omega)\ \|f\|_{H^1}^2$. Perturbations of solitary waves, denoted by $w_1(x,t)$, $w_2(x,t)$ and $\eta(x,t)$, are defined in the form

$$w_1(x,t)=e^{i\theta_1}e^{-i\frac{c}{2}(x+x_0-ct)}\phi(x+x_0,t)-R_1(x), \qquad (4.3)$$

$$w_2(x,t)=e^{i\theta_2}e^{-i\frac{c}{2}(x+x_0-ct)}\psi(x+x_0,t)-R_2(x), \qquad (4.4)$$

$$\eta(x,t)=u(x+x_0,t)+\frac{\beta}{c}\left[R_1^2(x)+R_2^2(x)\right], \qquad (4.5)$$

where $w_k(x,t)=p_k(x,t)+iq_k(x,t)$ $(k=1,2)$ are complex-valued functions, and $\eta(x,t)$ is a real-valued function. Here θ_1,θ_2 and x_0 will be chosen later where the infimum of I_Ω is attained. Eq. (4.2), and (4.3)-(4.5) show that we have to find estimates on the H^1 norms of $w_1(x,t)$ and $w_2(x,t)$, and the L^2 norm of $\eta(x,t)$.

The following lemma is a generalization of the one which was proved in the context of the orbital stability of solitary waves, by Bona [21] for the Korteweg-de Vries equation and by Angulo and Montenegro [22] for the long wave-short wave interaction equations with an integral term. The following lemma states that there are $\theta_i=\theta_i(t)$ $(i=1,2)$ and $x_0=x_0(t)$ such that infimum of $I_\Omega(x_0,\theta_1,\theta_2)$ exists where the local well-posedness of the Cauchy problem for (1.1) is used.

Lemma 2. Let (ϕ,ψ,u) be a solution of (1.1) corresponding to the initial data $(\phi_0,\psi_0,u_0)\in H^1(\mathbb{R})\times H^1(\mathbb{R})\times L^2(\mathbb{R})$ with the properties $\|\phi_0\|_2=\|R_1\|_2$ and $\|\psi_0\|_2=\|R_2\|_2$. Suppose that $I_\Omega(x_0,\theta_1,\theta_2)<\Omega(\|R_1\|_2^2+\|R_2\|_2^2)$ for some $t_0\in[0,T]$ and some $(x_0,\theta_1,\theta_2)\in\mathbb{R}\times[0,2\pi)\times[0,2\pi)$. Then $\inf\{I_\Omega|x_0\in\mathbb{R},\theta_1,\theta_2\in[0,2\pi)\}$ is assumed at least once.

Proof. It is clear that I_Ω is a continuous function of (x_0,θ_1,θ_2) on $\mathbb{R}\times[0,2\pi)\times[0,2\pi)$. Moreover, for any $(\theta_1, \theta_2) \in [0, 2\pi) \times [0, 2\pi)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{x_0 \to \mp\infty} I_\Omega(x_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) &= \|[e^{-i\frac{c}{2}(\cdot - ct)}\phi(\cdot, t)]'\|_2^2 + +\|[e^{-i\frac{c}{2}(\cdot - ct)}\psi(\cdot, t)]'\|_2^2 \\
&\quad +\|R_1'(\cdot)\|_2^2 + \|R_2'(\cdot)\|_2^2 + 2\Omega\|R_1(\cdot)\|_2^2 + 2\Omega\|R_2(\cdot)\|_2^2, \\
&= (\frac{7\Omega}{3} + \frac{c^2}{4})(\|R_1\|_2^2 + \|R_2\|_2^2), \qquad (4.6)
\end{aligned}$$

where (3.3) is used. The hypothesis $I_\Omega(x_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) < \Omega(\|R_1\|_2^2 + \|R_2\|_2^2)$, the continuity of I_Ω and (4.6) imply the result. □

We now show that the infimum of I_Ω is attained at a finite value of x_0 for some $t_0 \in [0, T]$. For this aim, it will suffice to show that $I_\Omega(x_0, \theta_1, \theta_2) < \Omega(\|R_1\|_2^2 + \|R_2\|_2^2)$ holds in some interval. Using the inequality $\|a + b\|_2^2 \leq 2\|a\|_2^2 + 2\|b\|_2^2$, one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
I_\Omega(ct, -\omega t, -\omega t) &\leq 2\|\phi'(\cdot) - \phi_s'(\cdot)\|_2^2 + (\frac{c^2}{2} + \Omega)\|\phi(\cdot) - \phi_s(\cdot)\|_2^2 \\
&\quad +2\|\psi'(\cdot) - \psi_s'(\cdot)\|_2^2 + (\frac{c^2}{2} + \Omega)\|\psi(\cdot) - \psi_s(\cdot)\|_2^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where prime denotes differentiation with respect to spatial variable x. Solitary wave solutions (ϕ_s, ψ_s) given in (1.2) are globally defined. Thus, it follows from the continuous dependence theory that, for a $T > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that if

$$\|\phi_0(.) - e^{i\frac{c}{2}\cdot} R_1(.)\|_{H^1} < \delta, \quad \text{and} \quad \|\psi_0(.) - e^{i\frac{c}{2}\cdot} R_2(.)\|_{H^1} < \delta,$$

then the solution $(\phi(x,t), \psi(x,t))$ corresponding to the initial data $(\phi_0(x), \psi_0(x))$ exists at least for $0 \leq t \leq T$. This solution also satisfies

$$\|\phi(\cdot, t) - \phi_s(\cdot, t)\|_{H^1} < \epsilon, \quad \text{and} \quad \|\psi(\cdot, t) - \psi_s(\cdot, t)\|_{H^1} < \epsilon.$$

Using this result, we get $I_\Omega(ct, -\omega t, -\omega t) \leq 4\epsilon^2(1 + \omega)$. Choosing $\epsilon^2 < \Omega(\|R_1\|_2^2 + \|R_2\|_2^2)/[4(1 + \omega)]$, shows that the hypothesis of Lemma 2 is satisfied at least for $(\tilde{x}_0, \tilde{\theta}_1, \tilde{\theta}_2) = (ct, -\omega t, -\omega t)$, from which we get an upper bound for I_Ω.

As a result of Lemma 2, the following compatibility conditions are obtained for the real-valued increment functions $p_i(x,t)$ and $q_i(x,t)$ $(i=1,2)$

$$\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} \left(R_1^2+R_2^2\right) R_1 q_1 dx = 0, \tag{4.7}$$

$$\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} \left(R_1^2+R_2^2\right) R_2 q_2 dx = 0, \tag{4.8}$$

$$\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} (R_1^2+R_2^2) \left(R_1 \frac{\partial p_1}{\partial x} + R_2 \frac{\partial p_2}{\partial x}\right) dx = 0. \tag{4.9}$$

The relations (4.7), (4.8) and (4.9) are obtained by differentiating I_Ω defined in (4.2) with respect to θ_1, θ_2 and x_0, using system (1.3) and then evaluating the resulting equations at values $(x_0, \theta_1, \theta_2)$ which minimize I_Ω. Note that

$$I_\Omega = \|e^{i\theta_1}A' - R_1'\|_2^2 + \|e^{i\theta_1}B' - R_2'\|_2^2 + \Omega\|e^{i\theta_1}A - R_1\|_2^2 + \Omega\|e^{i\theta_1}B - R_2\|_2^2,$$

where $e^{i\theta_1}e^{-i\frac{c}{2}(x+x_0-ct)}\phi(x+x_0,t) = e^{i\theta_1}A(x+x_0,t) = R_1(x) + w_1(x,t)$ and $e^{i\theta_2}e^{-i\frac{c}{2}(x+x_0-ct)}\psi(x+x_0,t) = e^{i\theta_2}B(x+x_0,t) = R_2(x) + w_2(x,t)$.

We now introduce a continuous nonlinear functional L, called the Lyapunov functional, over $H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}) \times L^2(\mathbb{R})$ in the form

$$L(\phi,\psi,u) = \omega(I_1+I_2) + \frac{c}{2}I_3 + I_4, \tag{4.10}$$

where I_k $(k=1,2,3,4)$, given in (2.4), are the conserved quantities of system (1.1). Thus, the Lyapunov functional is invariant with time: $\Delta L(0) = \Delta L(t)$. Our stability result will rely on the inequalities

$$\Delta L(0) \le 2g(\varepsilon)$$

$$\Delta L(t) \ge g(\|w_1\|_{H^1}) + g(\|w_2\|_{H^1}),$$

where $g(x) = a_1x^2 - a_2x^3 - a_3x^4$ for some positive constants a_i $(i=1,2,3)$, and $\|w_i\|_{H^1}$ $(i=1,2)$ is the distance between the solitary wave (Φ,Ψ) and the solution (ϕ,ψ) of (1.1). To find the bounds, we calculate $\Delta L(t)$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta L(t) &= L(\phi(x,t),\psi(x,t),u(x,t)) - L(\Phi(x),\Psi(x),U(x)), \\ &= L\left(\Phi(x) + e^{i\frac{cx}{2}}w_1(x,t), \Psi(x) + e^{i\frac{cx}{2}}w_2(x,t), U(x) + \eta(x,t)\right) \\ &\quad -L(\Phi(x),\Psi(x),U(x)). \end{aligned}$$

Expanding the functional L near (Φ, Ψ) yields

$$\Delta L(t) = \delta L + \delta^2 L + \delta^3 L, \tag{4.11}$$

where δL, $\delta^2 L$ and $\delta^3 L$ are the first, second and third variations of L, respectively; and all variations higher than third order are zero. The explicit forms of variations are given as

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta L &= \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} 2\left\{\left[R_{1,xx} - \Omega R_1 + \gamma(R_1^2 + R_2^2)R_1\right] p_1\right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left[R_{2,xx} - \Omega R_2 + \gamma(R_1^2 + R_2^2)R_2\right] p_2\right\} dx, & (4.12) \\
\delta^2 L &= \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} \left[\frac{c}{2}\eta^2 + p_{1,x}^2 + q_{1,x}^2 + p_{2,x}^2 + q_{2,x}^2 + \Omega(p_1^2 + q_1^2 + p_2^2 + q_2^2)\right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2\beta(R_1 p_1 + R_2 p_2)\eta - \gamma(R_1^2 + R_2^2)(p_1^2 + q_1^2 + p_2^2 + q_2^2)\right] dx, & (4.13) \\
\delta^3 L &= \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} \beta(p_1^2 + q_1^2 + p_2^2 + q_2^2)\eta \; dx, & (4.14)
\end{aligned}$$

where the relations $\Phi(x) = R_1(x)e^{\frac{icx}{2}}$, $\Psi(x) = R_2(x)e^{\frac{icx}{2}}$, $W(x) = -\beta^2(R_1^2(x) + R_2^2(x))/c$, and $w_k(x) = p_k(x) + iq_k(x)$ $(k = 1, 2)$ are used. Because (R_1, R_2) is a solution (1.3), the first variation (4.12) vanishes. Thus (R_1, R_2) is also a critical point of the Lyapunov functional L. From eqs. (4.13) and (4.14), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta L(t) &= \langle L_0 q_1, q_1\rangle + \langle L_0 q_2, q_2\rangle + \langle L_1 p_1, p_1\rangle + \langle L_2 p_2, p_2\rangle + 2\langle L_3 p_1, p_2\rangle \\
&\quad -\gamma \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} \left[\frac{1}{2}(p_1^2 + q_1^2 + p_2^2 + q_2^2)^2 + 2(p_1^2 + q_1^2 + p_2^2 + q_2^2)(p_1 R_1 + p_2 R_2)\right] dx \\
&\quad +\frac{c}{2} \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} \left[\eta + \frac{2\beta}{c}(p_1 R_1 + p_2 R_2) + \frac{\beta}{c}(p_1^2 + q_1^2 + p_2^2 + q_2^2)\right]^2 dx, \qquad (4.15)
\end{aligned}$$

where the operators L_i $(i = 0, 1, 2, 3)$ are defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
L_0 &= -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \Omega - \gamma(R_1^2 + R_2^2), \qquad L_1 = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \Omega - \gamma(3R_1^2 + R_2^2), \\
L_2 &= -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \Omega - \gamma(R_1^2 + 3R_2^2), \qquad L_3 = -2\gamma R_1 R_2.
\end{aligned}$$

We use the following lemmas to find a lower bound for $\Delta L(t)$.

Lemma 3. There exist positive constants C_i $(i = 1, 2)$ such that

$$\langle L_0 q_i, q_i\rangle \ \geq C_i \|q_i\|_{H^1}^2 \quad (i = 1, 2). \tag{4.16}$$

Proof. It should be noted that $L_0 R_i = 0$ and $R_i > 0$ $(i = 1, 2)$. Therefore L_0 is a non-negative operator, i.e. $\mu_i = \inf(\langle L_0 q_i, q_i\rangle / \langle q_i, q_i\rangle) \geq 0$ $(i = 1, 2)$. If the infimum of the functional μ_i subject to the constraints (4.7) and (4.8) is zero then it is attained at $q_i(x) = R_i(x)$. This contradicts to the above constraints, thus $\mu_i > 0$ $(i = 1, 2)$, i.e.

$$\langle L_0 q_i, q_i\rangle = \frac{1}{k_i + 1}\|q_i\| - \gamma \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} (R_1^2 + R_2^2) q_1^2 dx + \frac{k_i}{k_i + 1}\|q_i\| \ \geq \bar{C}_i \|q_i\|_2^2 \quad (i = 1, 2)$$

where $\|q_i\| = \|\nabla q_i\|_2^2 + \Omega \|q_i\|_2^2$, k_i and $\bar{C}_i$ are some positive constants. If $k_i < \bar{C}_i / (2\gamma E^2)$ where $E = \max(\|R_1\|_\infty, \|R_2\|_\infty)$, then we have $\|q_i\|/(k_i + 1) - \gamma \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} (R_1^2 + R_2^2) q_1^2 dx > 0$, and consequently

$$\langle L_0 q_i, q_i\rangle \ \geq C_i \|q_i\|_{H^1}^2 \quad (i = 1, 2),$$

where $C_i = k_i \min(1, \Omega)/(k_i + 1)$. □

To find a lower bound for the expression $\langle L_1 p_1, p_1\rangle + \langle L_2 p_2, p_2\rangle + 2\langle L_3 p_1, p_2\rangle$ in (4.15) is more difficult than that of $\langle L_0 q_i, q_i\rangle$. We will use the facts that (R_1, R_2) is the minimizer of the functional $J(u, v)$ and that the expression $\langle L_1 p_1, p_1\rangle + \langle L_2 p_2, p_2\rangle + 2\langle L_3 p_1, p_2\rangle$ is associated with the second variation of $J(u, v)$. First we prove the following lemma which is a generalization of the one given in [23].

Lemma 4. $\inf\limits_{\substack{\langle f, R_1\rangle = 0 \\ \langle g, R_2\rangle = 0}} (\langle L_1 f, f\rangle + \langle L_2 g, g\rangle + 2\langle L_3 f, g\rangle) = 0.$

Proof. Recall that (R_1, R_2) is a minimizer of the nonlinear functional $J(u, v)$. Thus $\delta^2 J \geq 0$ near (R_1, R_2). The second variation of the functional J is of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2}{d\epsilon^2} J(R_1 + \epsilon\eta_1,\, R_2 + \epsilon\eta_2)\mid_{\epsilon=0} \;&=\; a^2\left(\langle L_1\eta_1, \eta_1\rangle + \langle L_2\eta_2, \eta_2\rangle + 2\langle L_3\eta_1, \eta_2\rangle\right) \\ &+a^2\left[\frac{\Omega^2}{3d}(\langle R_1,\, \eta_1\rangle + \langle R_2,\, \eta_2\rangle)^2\right. \\ &\left.+\frac{2\Omega}{d}(\langle R_1,\, \eta_1\rangle + \langle R_2,\, \eta_2\rangle)(\langle R_{1,x},\, \eta_{1,x}\rangle + \langle R_{2,x},\, \eta_{2,x}\rangle)\right] \\ &-\frac{a^2}{d}\left(\langle R_{1,x},\, \eta_{1,x}\rangle + \langle R_{2,x},\, \eta_{2,x}\rangle\right)^2 \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

where $a^2 = [27\gamma^2/(\Omega^3 d^6)]^{1/8}/(4\sqrt{2})$, and $d = \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} (u_x^2 + v_x^2) dx$. It should be noted that eq. (1.3) and Pohozaev type identities given by (3.3) are used in obtaining (4.17).

If the increment functions are chosen as $\eta_1 = f$ and $\eta_2 = g$ with the properties $\langle f, R_1\rangle = 0$ and

$\langle g, R_2\rangle = 0$, then it follows from (4.17) that

$$\langle L_1 f, f\rangle + \langle L_2 g, g\rangle + 2\langle L_3 f, g\rangle \ \geq 0. \tag{4.18}$$

Moreover, the functions $R_{1,x}$ and $R_{2,x}$ satisfy

$$\left.\begin{aligned} L_1 R_{1,x} + L_3 R_{2,x} &= \big(-R_{1,xx} + \Omega R_1 - \gamma(R_1^2 + R_2^2)R_1\big)_x = 0, \\ L_2 R_{2,x} + L_3 R_{1,x} &= \big(-R_{2,xx} + \Omega R_2 - \gamma(R_1^2 + R_2^2)R_2\big)_x = 0. \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{4.19}$$

As a result of (4.19) we find

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle L_1 R_{1,x}, R_{1,x}\rangle + \langle L_2 R_{2,x}, R_{2,x}\rangle + \langle L_3 R_{1,x}, R_{2,x}\rangle + \langle L_3 R_{2,x}, R_{1,x}\rangle \\ &\qquad = \langle L_1 R_{1,x} + L_3 R_{2,x}, R_{1,x}\rangle + \langle L_2 R_{2,x} + L_3 R_{1,x}, R_{2,x}\rangle = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which shows that the infimum of (4.18) is assumed at $(R_{1,x}, R_{2,x})$. Because $f = R_{1,x}$ and $g = R_{2,x}$ satisfy the hypothesis of the lemma, we get $\langle f, R_1\rangle = \langle R_{1,x}, R_1\rangle = 0$ and $\langle g, R_2\rangle = \langle R_{2,x}, R_2\rangle = 0$. This completes the proof. □

In order to find a lower bound for $\langle L_1 p_1, p_1\rangle + \langle L_2 p_2, p_2\rangle + 2\langle L_3 p_1, p_2\rangle$, we require that the perturbed solution has the same L^2-norm as the solitary wave, as given in the hypotheses of Lemma 2,

$$\|\phi\|_2 = \|R_1\|_2, \quad \|\psi\|_2 = \|R_2\|_2. \tag{4.20}$$

Conditions (4.20) give rise to the following constraints

$$\langle R_i, p_i\rangle = -\frac{1}{2}[\langle p_i, p_i\rangle + \langle q_i, q_i\rangle] = -\frac{1}{2}\|w_i\|_2^2 \ < 0 \quad (i = 1, 2), \tag{4.21}$$

where definitions (4.3) are used. The restrictions (4.20) will be relaxed later and the stability of solitary waves will be proved with respect to general perturbations. To this end, we assume that the real parts of the increment functions, $p_i(x, t)$ $(i = 1, 2)$, will be of the form $p_i = p_{i\|} + p_{i\perp}$ where

$$p_{i\|} = \frac{\langle p_i,\, R_i\rangle}{\|R_i\|_2^2} R_i, \quad p_{i\perp} = p_i - \frac{\langle p_i,\, R_i\rangle}{\|R_i\|_2^2} R_i.$$

This gives rise to $\langle p_{i\perp}, R_i\rangle = 0 \ \ (i=1,2)$. Using the decomposition of $p_i(x,t)$ $(i=1,2)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle L_1p_1, p_1\rangle + \langle L_2p_2, p_2\rangle + 2\langle L_3p_1, p_2\rangle \\ &\qquad\qquad = \langle L_1p_{1\perp}, p_{1\perp}\rangle + \langle L_2p_{2\perp}, p_{2\perp}\rangle + 2\langle L_3p_{1\perp}, p_{2\perp}\rangle \\ &\qquad\qquad + \langle L_1p_{1\|}, p_{1\|}\rangle + \langle L_2p_{2\|}, p_{2\|}\rangle + 2\langle L_3p_{1\|}, p_{2\|}\rangle + 2\langle L_1p_{1\perp}, p_{1\|}\rangle \\ &\qquad\qquad + 2\langle L_2p_{2\perp}, p_{2\|}\rangle + 2\langle L_3p_{2\|}, p_{1\perp}\rangle + 2\langle L_3p_{1\|}, p_{2\perp}\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{4.22}$$

To find a suitable lower bound for $\langle L_1p_{1\perp}, p_{1\perp}\rangle + \langle L_2p_{2\perp}, p_{2\perp}\rangle + 2\langle L_3p_{1\perp}, p_{2\perp}\rangle$ using Lemma 4, we further assume that $\langle p_1,\ R_1\rangle/\|R_1\|_2^2 = \langle p_2,\ R_2\rangle/\|R_2\|_2^2$.

Lemma 5. There exist positive constants C_3 and C_4 such that

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle L_1p_{1\perp}, p_{1\perp}\rangle + \langle L_2p_{2\perp}, p_{2\perp}\rangle + 2\langle L_3p_{1\perp}, p_{2\perp}\rangle \\ &\qquad \geq C_3(\|p_1\|_2^2 + \|p_2\|_2^2) - C_4(\|w_1\|_{H^1}^4 - \|w_2\|_{H^1}^4). \end{aligned} \tag{4.23}$$

Proof. If $f = p_{1\perp}$ and $g = p_{2\perp}$ then the hypotheses of Lemma 4 are satisfied by $p_{1\perp}$ and $p_{2\perp}$. That is,

$$\langle L_1p_{1\perp}, p_{1\perp}\rangle + \langle L_2p_{2\perp}, p_{2\perp}\rangle + 2\langle L_3p_{1\perp}, p_{2\perp}\rangle \geq 0. \tag{4.24}$$

The infimum of (4.24) is zero. This infimum is attained at $(p_{1\perp}, p_{2\perp}) = (R_{1,x}, R_{2,x})$. In such a case, for the increment functions $p_i = \alpha R_i + R_{i,x}$ $(i=1,2)$ where $\alpha = \langle p_i, R_i\rangle/\|R_i\|_2^2$ $(i=1,2)$, the constraint (4.9) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\alpha}{4}\int_{\mathbb{R}} [(R_1^2+R_2^2)^2]_x dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}} (R_1^2+R_2^2)(R_1R_{1xx} + R_2R_{2xx})dx = 0, \\ &\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left\{[(R_1^2+R_2^2)_x]^2 + 2(R_1^2+R_2^2)[(R_{1,x})^2 + (R_{2,x})^2]\right\} dx = 0,\end{aligned}$$

where integration by parts is used. This result leads to $R_i = 0$ $(i=1,2)$ which contradicts positivity of ground state solutions (R_1, R_2). Thus there exists a positive constant $\bar{C}_3$ such that

$$\langle L_1p_{1\perp}, p_{1\perp}\rangle + \langle L_2p_{2\perp}, p_{2\perp}\rangle + 2\langle L_3p_{1\perp}, p_{2\perp}\rangle \geq \bar{C}_3. \tag{4.25}$$

Moreover, using $\langle p_{i\perp}, p_{i\perp}\rangle = \langle p_i, p_i\rangle - [\langle p_i, p_i\rangle + \langle q_i, q_i\rangle]^2/(4\|R_i\|_2^2)$, the inequality (4.25) can be arranged to yield (4.23)

$$\begin{aligned}\langle L_1 p_{1\perp}, p_{1\perp}\rangle + \langle L_2 p_{2\perp}, p_{2\perp}\rangle + 2\langle L_3 p_{1\perp}, p_{2\perp}\rangle &\geq C_3(\langle p_{1\perp}, p_{1\perp}\rangle + \langle p_{2\perp}, p_{2\perp}\rangle), \\ &= C_3\left(\|p_1\|_2^2 + \|p_2\|_2^2 - \frac{\|w_1\|_2^4}{4\|R_1\|_2^2} - \frac{\|w_2\|_2^4}{4\|R_2\|_2^2}\right), \\ &\geq C_3(\|p_1\|_2^2 + \|p_2\|_2^2) - C_4(\|w_1\|_{H^1}^4 + \|w_2\|_{H^1}^4),\end{aligned}$$

where continuous embedding of $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ in $L^4(\mathbb{R})$ is used, and C_3 and C_4 are some positive constants. This completes the proof of Lemma 5. □

Lemma 6. There exist positive constants C_5 and C_6 such that

$$\langle L_1 p_{1\|}, p_{1\|}\rangle + \langle L_2 p_{2\|}, p_{2\|}\rangle + 2\langle L_3 p_{1\|}, p_{2\|}\rangle \geq -C_5\|w_1\|_{H^1}^4 - C_6\|w_2\|_{H^1}^4. \tag{4.26}$$

Proof. Recall that $\langle L_i R_i, R_i\rangle = -2\gamma\langle R_i^2, R_i^2\rangle$ $(i = 1, 2)$. Firstly, using $p_{i\|} = \alpha R_i$ $(i = 1, 2)$ where $\alpha = -\|w_i\|_2^2/(2\|R_i\|_2^2)$, we obtain

$$\langle L_i p_{i\|}, p_{i\|}\rangle = \alpha^2\langle L_i R_i, R_i\rangle = -\frac{\gamma}{2}\frac{\|R_i^2\|_2^2}{\|R_i\|_2^4}\,\|w_i\|_2^4 \geq -\bar{C}_{4+i}\|w_i\|_{H^1}^4 \quad (i = 1, 2), \tag{4.27}$$

where $\bar{C}_5$ and $\bar{C}_6$ are positive constants. Secondly, using Sobolev embedding and Young's inequality $ab \leq a^p/p + b^q/q$ with $p = q = 2$, we obtain

$$\langle L_3 p_{1\|}, p_{2\|}\rangle = -\frac{\gamma}{4}\,\frac{\|R_1 R_2\|_2^2}{\|R_1\|_2^2\,\|R_2\|_2^2}\,\|w_1\|_2^2\,\|w_2\|_2^2 \;\geq -\frac{\bar{C}_7}{2}\left(\|w_1\|_{H^1}^4 + \|w_2\|_{H^1}^4\right), \tag{4.28}$$

where $\bar{C}_7$ is a positive constant. (4.26) follows from (4.27) and (4.28). □

Lemma 7. $\langle L_3 p_{1\|}, p_{2\perp}\rangle = 0$ and $\langle L_3 p_{2\|}, p_{1\perp}\rangle = 0$.

Proof. Using the definition of the operator L_3, we have $\langle L_3 p_{1\|}, p_{2\perp}\rangle = -2\gamma\alpha\langle R_2^2 p_{1\perp}, R_1\rangle$. Then

$$|\langle L_3 p_{1\|}, p_{2\perp}\rangle| \leq |2\gamma\alpha|E^2|\langle p_{1\perp}, R_1\rangle| = 0 \tag{4.29}$$

and, similarly

$$|\langle L_3 p_{2\|}, p_{1\perp}\rangle| \leq |2\gamma\alpha|E^2|\langle p_{2\perp}, R_2\rangle| = 0. \tag{4.30}$$

This completes the proof. □

Lemma 8. There exist positive constants E_i and F_i $(i = 1, 2)$ such that

$$2\langle L_i p_{i\perp}, p_{i\|}\rangle \geq -E_i \|w_i\|_{H^1}^3 - F_i \|w_i\|_{H^1}^4 \quad (i = 1, 2). \tag{4.31}$$

Proof. For the terms $\langle L_i p_{i\perp}, p_{i\|}\rangle$, we find

$$\langle L_i p_{i\perp}, p_{i\|}\rangle = \alpha \left(\langle R_{i,x}, p_{i\perp,x}\rangle - 3\gamma \langle R_i^3, p_{i\perp}\rangle - \gamma \langle R_j^2 R_i, p_{i\perp}\rangle \right), \quad (i, j = 1, 2 \;\; i \neq j), \tag{4.32}$$

where $\alpha = -\|w_i\|_2^2/(2\|R_i\|_2^2)$, $|\langle R_i^3, p_{i\perp}\rangle| \leq E^2 |\langle R_i, p_{i\perp}\rangle| = 0$, and $|\langle R_j^2 R_i, p_{i\perp}\rangle| \leq E^2 |\langle R_i, p_{i\perp}\rangle| = 0$. Using $p_{i\perp} = p_i - \alpha R_i$ and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality in (4.32), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle L_i p_{i\perp}, p_{i\|}\rangle &\geq -\frac{\|w_i\|_2}{2\|R_i\|_2^2} \langle R_{i,x}, p_{i,x}\rangle - \frac{\|R_{i,x}\|_2^2}{4\|R_i\|_2^4} \, \|w_i\|_2^4, \\ &\geq -\frac{\|R_{i,x}\|_2}{2\|R_i\|_2^2} \, \|w_i\|_2^2 \, \|w_{i,x}\|_2 - \frac{\|R_{i,x}\|_2^2}{4\|R_i\|_2^4} \, \|w_i\|_2^4 \quad (i = 1, 2). \end{aligned}$$

By continuous embedding of $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ the result follows

$$\langle L_i p_{i\perp}, p_{i\|}\rangle \geq -\frac{E_i}{2} \|w_i\|_{H^1}^3 - \frac{F_i}{2} \|w_i\|_{H^1}^4 \qquad (i = 1, 2),$$

where E_i and F_i are some positive constants . □

Lemma 9. There exist positive constants A_i $(i = 1, 2, 3)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle L_1 p_1, p_1\rangle + \langle L_2 p_2, p_2\rangle + 2\langle L_3 p_1, p_2\rangle \quad &\geq \quad A_1 \left(\|p_1\|_{H^1}^2 + \|p_2\|_{H^1}^2 \right) \\ -A_2 \left(\|w_1\|_{H^1}^3 + \|w_2\|_{H^1}^3 \right) &- A_3 \left(\|w_1\|_{H^1}^4 + \|w_2\|_{H^1}^4 \right). \end{aligned} \tag{4.33}$$

Proof. By direct computation, one can see that

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle L_1 p_1, p_1\rangle + \langle L_2 p_2, p_2\rangle + 2\langle L_3 p_1, p_2\rangle \\ &\qquad = -\gamma \int_{\mathbb{R}} [(R_1^2 + R_2^2)(p_1^2 + p_2^2) + 2(R_1 P_1 + R_2 p_2)^2] dx \\ &\qquad + \; \|p_1\| + \|p_2\|, \end{aligned} \tag{4.34}$$

where $\|p_i\| = \Omega \|p_i\|_2^2 + \|\nabla p_i\|_2^2$ $(i = 1, 2)$. On the other hand, combining the inequalities (4.23), (4.26), (4.29), (4.30) and (4.31), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\langle L_1p_1,p_1\rangle+\langle L_2p_2,p_2\rangle+2\langle L_3p_1,p_2\rangle \quad \geq \quad & C_3(\|p_1\|_2^2+\|p_2\|_2^2)\\ & -E_1\|w_1\|_{H^1}^3-E_2\|w_2\|_{H^1}^3\\ & -C_8\|w_1\|_{H^1}^4-C_9\|w_2\|_{H^1}^4, \qquad (4.35)\end{aligned}$$

where $C_8=C_4+C_5+F_1$ and $C_9=C_4+C_6+F_2$ are positive constants.

Using (4.34) and (4.35), for a sufficiently small positive number m, we find

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \frac{1}{m+1}(\|p_1\|+\|p_2\|)-\gamma\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}}[(R_1^2+R_2^2)(p_1^2+p_2^2)+2(R_1P_1+R_2p_2)^2]dx\\ &\geq \bar{C}_1(\|p_1\|_2^2+\|p_2\|_2^2)-A_2(\|w_1\|_{H^1}^3+\|w_2\|_{H^1}^3)-A_3(\|w_1\|_{H^1}^4+\|w_2\|_{H^1}^4)\\ &\geq -A_2(\|w_1\|_{H^1}^3+\|w_2\|_{H^1}^3)-A_3(\|w_1\|_{H^1}^4+\|w_2\|_{H^1}^4), \qquad (4.36)\end{aligned}$$

where $-\gamma\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}}[(R_1^2+R_2^2)(p_1^2+p_2^2)+2(R_1P_1+R_2p_2)^2]dx \geq -6\gamma E^2(\|p_1\|_2^2+\|p_2\|_2^2)$ is used, and $\bar{C}_1=(C_3-6\gamma mE^2)/(m+1)$, $A_2=\max(E_1,E_2)/(m+1)$ and $A_3=\max(C_8,C_9)/(m+1)$ are positive constants. Recalling that $\langle L_1p_1,p_1\rangle+\langle L_2p_2,p_2\rangle+2\langle L_3p_1,p_2\rangle=I+m(\|p_1\|+\|p_2\|)/(m+1)$ we obtain (4.33) where $A_1=m\min(1,\Omega)/(1+m)$. This completes the proof of the lemma. □

Finally, the integral term in (4.15) can be estimated as

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|-\gamma\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}}\left[\frac{1}{2}(p_1^2+q_1^2+p_2^2+q_2^2)^2+2(p_1^2+q_1^2+p_2^2+q_2^2)(p_1R_1+p_2R_2)\right]dx\right|\\ &\qquad\leq \bar{D}_1\|w_1\|_{H^1}(\|w_1\|_{H^1}^2+\|w_2\|_{H^1}^2)\\ &\qquad\quad+\bar{D}_2\|w_2\|_{H^1}(\|w_1\|_{H^1}^2+\|w_2\|_{H^1}^2)+\gamma\|w_1\|_4^4+\gamma\|w_2\|_4^4,\\ &\qquad\leq D_1\|w_1\|_{H^1}^3+D_2\|w_2\|_{H^1}^3+D_3\|w_1\|_{H^1}^4+D_4\|w_2\|_{H^1}^4, \qquad (4.37)\end{aligned}$$

where continuous embedding of $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ in $L^4(\mathbb{R})$ and in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and Young's inequality $ab\leq a^p/p+b^q/q$ with $p=3$ and $q=3/2$, are used, and D_i $(i=1,2,3,4)$ are positive constants.

Proof of Theorem 1. Combining the inequalities (4.16), (4.33) and (4.37), an upper bound for ΔL is given in terms of H^1 norms of the increment functions w_i as follows

$$\Delta L(t)\geq g(\|w_1\|_{H^1})+g(\|w_2\|_{H^1}), \qquad (4.38)$$

where $g(x) = a_1x^2 - a_2x^3 - a_3x^4$ with positive constants

$$a_1 = \min(C_1, C_2, A_1), \quad a_2 = A_2 + \max(D_1, D_2), \quad a_3 = A_3 + \max(D_3, D_4).$$

Because $g(0) = 0$ and $g(x) \approx a_1x^2$ near $x = 0$, there exists a positive number ϵ, $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, such that $g(x)$ increases on $[0, \epsilon_0]$. For such an ϵ, the inequalities

$$\|w_1(0)\|_{H^1} = \|\phi_0(.) - \Phi(.)\|_{H^1} \leq \delta, \quad \|w_2(0)\|_{H^1} = \|\psi_0(.) - \Psi(.)\|_{H^1} \leq \delta,$$

imply that

$$\Delta L(0) < g(\epsilon) + g(\epsilon)$$

for sufficiently small δ. As $L(t)$ is invariant with time, i.e. $\Delta L(t) = \Delta L(0)$; from (4.38), we have

$$g(\|w_1(t)\|_{H^1}) + g(\|w_2(t)\|_{H^1}) \leq \Delta L(t) = \Delta L(0) < g(\epsilon) + g(\epsilon).$$

By continuity of the function g, there is at least a number $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_1 \leq \epsilon_0$ such that

$$\|w_1(t)\|_{H^1} \leq \epsilon_1 \leq c_1\epsilon \;\text{ and }\; \|w_2(t)\|_{H^1} \leq \epsilon_1 \leq c_2\epsilon,$$

where $t \in [0, \infty)$ and c_i $(i = 1, 2)$ are positive constants.

Finally for the increment $\eta(x, t)$, we have to prove that $\|\eta(t)\|_2 \leq c\epsilon$ using the results obtained for $\|w_1(t)\|_{H^1}$ and $\|w_2(t)\|_{H^1}$. In (4.38) we have shown that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta L(t) &= K + \frac{c}{2}\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} \left[\eta + \frac{2\beta}{c}(p_1R_1 + p_2R_2) + \frac{\beta}{c}(p_1^2 + q_1^2 + p_2^2 + q_2^2)\right]^2 dx \\ &\geq g(\|w_1(t)\|_{H^1}) + g(\|w_2(t)\|_{H^1}) \\ &\quad + \frac{c}{2}\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} \left[\eta + \frac{2\beta}{c}(p_1R_1 + p_2R_2) + \frac{\beta}{c}(p_1^2 + q_1^2 + p_2^2 + q_2^2)\right]^2 dx, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} K = {} & \langle L_0q_1, q_1\rangle + \langle L_0q_2, q_2\rangle + \langle L_1p_1, p_1\rangle + \langle L_2p_2, p_2\rangle + 2\langle L_3p_1, p_2\rangle \\ & - \gamma\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} \left[\frac{1}{2}(p_1^2 + q_1^2 + p_2^2 + q_2^2)^2 + 2(p_1^2 + q_1^2 + p_2^2 + q_2^2)(p_1R_1 + p_2R_2)\right] dx. \end{aligned}$$

For a given $\epsilon > 0$ with $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, the function g is increasing and $g(\|w_i(t)\|_{H^1}) > 0$ for $\|w_i(t)\|_{H^1} < c_i\epsilon$ $(i = 1, 2)$. This shows that $K > 0$. By the invariance property of the functional L, $\Delta L(t) = \Delta L(0)$, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[\eta + \frac{2\beta}{c}(p_1R_1 + p_2R_2) + \frac{\beta}{c}(p_1^2 + q_1^2 + p_2^2 + q_2^2)\right]^2 dx \le \frac{4}{c}g(\epsilon).$$

Using the inequalities $(a+b)^2 \ge \dfrac{a^2}{2} - b^2$ and $(a+b)^2 \le 2(a^2+b^2)$, we find

$$\|\eta(t)\|_2^2 \le \frac{8}{c}g(\epsilon) + c_3(\|w_1(t)\|_{H^1}^2 + \|w_2(t)\|_{H^1}^2) + c_4(\|w_1(t)\|_{H^1}^4 + \|w_2(t)\|_{H^1}^2), \tag{4.39}$$

where the embedding of $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ into $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and $L^4(\mathbb{R})$ is used, and c_3 and c_4 are positive constants. For some $c > 0$, we have $\|\eta(t)\|_2 \le c\epsilon$. Thus we have proved that solitary waves (ϕ_s, ψ_s, u_s) (1.2) are orbitally stable with respect to the small perturbations preserving the L^2 norms.

In order to prove stability of solitary waves with respect to general perturbations, we consider a solitary wave solution $(Q_{1\Omega}, Q_{2\Omega})$ which satisfy the system (1.3)

$$Q''_{1\Omega} - \Omega Q_{1\Omega} + \gamma(Q_{1\Omega}^2 + Q_{2\Omega}^2)Q_{1\Omega} = 0,$$
$$Q''_{2\Omega} - \Omega Q_{2\Omega} + \gamma(Q_{1\Omega}^2 + Q_{2\Omega}^2)Q_{2\Omega} = 0,$$

where $\|\phi_0\|_2 \ne \|Q_{1\Omega}\|_2$ and $\|\psi_0\|_2 \ne \|Q_{2\Omega}\|_2$. Then, the functions $P_i(x) = Q_{i\Omega}(x/\sqrt{\Omega})/\sqrt{\Omega}$ $(i = 1, 2)$, satisfy

$$P''_1 - P_1 + \gamma(P_1^2 + P_2^2)P_1 = 0,$$
$$P''_2 - P_2 + \gamma(P_1^2 + P_2^2)P_2 = 0,$$

where $\|P_i\|_2 = \|Q_{i\Omega}\|_2/\sqrt[4]{\Omega}$ $(i = 1, 2)$. Thus, for the solution $(Q_{1\Omega_0}, Q_{2\Omega_0})$ corresponding to $\Omega_0 > 0$, we have $\|P_i\|_2 = \|Q_{i\Omega_0}\|_2/\sqrt[4]{\Omega_0}$. It is possible to choose Ω_0 such that $\|\phi_0\|_2 = \|Q_{1\Omega_0}\|_2$ and $\|\psi_0\|_2 = \|Q_{2\Omega_0}\|_2$. In the proof of stability of solitary waves $(Q_{1\Omega}, Q_{2\Omega})$ relative to general perturbations that do not preserve L^2 norms, assuming the initial data obey the inequalities $\|\phi_0(.) - Q_{1\Omega}(.)e^{\frac{ic.}{2}}\|_{H^1} \le \delta$ and $\|\psi_0(.) - Q_{2\Omega}(.)e^{\frac{ic.}{2}}\|_{H^1} \le \delta$, the idea is to apply the preceding stability theory for $(Q_{1\Omega_0}, Q_{2\Omega_0})$ and then to use the triangle inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \|e^{i\theta_1}\phi(.+x_0,t)-Q_{1\Omega}(.)e^{\frac{ic.}{2}}\|_{H^1} &\leq \|e^{i\theta_1}\phi(.+x_0,t)-Q_{1\Omega_0}(.)e^{\frac{ic.}{2}}\|_{H^1} \\ &\quad +\|Q_{1\Omega_0}(.)-Q_{1\Omega}(.)\|_{H^1}, \qquad (4.40) \\ \|e^{i\theta_2}\psi(.+x_0,t)-Q_{2\Omega}(.)e^{\frac{ic.}{2}}\|_{H^1} &\leq \|e^{i\theta_2}\psi(.+x_0,t)-Q_{2\Omega_0}(.)e^{\frac{ic.}{F2}}\|_{H^1} \\ &\quad +\|Q_{2\Omega_0}(.)-Q_{2\Omega}(.)\|_{H^1}. \qquad (4.41) \end{aligned}$$

The first terms in the right hand side of the inequalities (4.40) and (4.41) are bounded from above by the orbital stability of the solutions $(Q_{1\Omega_0}, Q_{2\Omega_0})$. It remains to determine δ and to show that $\|Q_{i\Omega_0}-Q_{i\Omega}\|_{H^1}$ $(i=1,2)$ are also small. From the definitions of $Q_{i\Omega}$ and $Q_{i\Omega_0}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_{i\Omega}-Q_{i\Omega_0}\|^2_{H^1} &= \sqrt{\Omega}\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} |\ P_i(x)-\sqrt{\frac{\Omega_0}{\Omega}}\ P_i(\sqrt{\frac{\Omega_0}{\Omega}}\ x)|^2dx \\ &\quad +\sqrt{\Omega^3}\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} |\ P_i'(x)-\frac{\Omega_0}{\Omega}\ P_i'(\sqrt{\frac{\Omega_0}{\Omega}}\ x)|^2dx \quad (i=1,2). \qquad (4.42) \end{aligned}$$

Using the inequality $(a-\epsilon b)^2 \leq 2\epsilon^2(a-b)^2+2(1-\epsilon)^2a^2$, (4.42) is rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_{i\Omega}-Q_{i\Omega_0}\|^2_{H^1} = \sqrt{2}\Omega &\left(\frac{\Omega_0}{\Omega}\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} |\ P_i(x)-\ P_i(\sqrt{\frac{\Omega_0}{\Omega}}\ x)|^2dx\right. \\ &\left.+(\frac{\Omega_0}{\Omega}-1)^2\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}}\ P_i^2(x)dx\right) \\ &+2\sqrt{\Omega^3}\left(\frac{\Omega_0^2}{\Omega^2}\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} |\ P_i'(x)-P_i'(\sqrt{\frac{\Omega_0}{\Omega}}\ x)|^2dx\right. \\ &\left.+(\frac{\Omega_0}{\Omega}-1)^2\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}}\ (P_i'(x))^2dx\right). \qquad (4.43) \end{aligned}$$

Following the results of Angulo *et. al.* [24], obtained in the study of the stability of solitary waves in the critical case for a generalized Korteweg-de Vries equation and a generalized NLS equation, an upper bound for (4.43) can be given as follows

$$\|Q_{i\Omega_0}-Q_{i\Omega}\|^2_{H^1} \quad \leq \quad G_i\ (\sqrt[4]{\Omega_0}-\sqrt[4]{\Omega})^2+H_i\ (\sqrt{\Omega_0}-\sqrt{\Omega})^2 \quad (i=1,2),$$

where the fundamental theorem of calculus and Minkowski's inequality are used, and the positive constants G_i and H_i $(i = 1, 2)$ are given as

$$G_i = 8\sqrt{\frac{\Omega_0}{\Omega}}\left(\|xP_i'\|_2^2 + \Omega_0\|xP_i''\|_2^2\right), \quad H_i = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\Omega}}\left(\|P_i\|_2^2 + (\sqrt{\Omega_0} + \sqrt{\Omega})^2\|P_i'\|_2^2\right).$$

We now show that there exists a positive constant $C = C(\Omega_0, P_i)$ such that $|\sqrt{\Omega_0} - \sqrt{\Omega}| \leq C\delta$ at least for small values of δ. Using the results

$$\sqrt{\Omega_0} = \frac{\|Q_{i\Omega_0}\|_2^2}{\|P_i\|_2^2} = \frac{\|\phi_0\|_2^2}{\|P_1\|_2^2} = \frac{\|\psi_0\|_2^2}{\|P_2\|_2^2}, \quad \sqrt{\Omega} = \frac{\|Q_{i\Omega}\|_2^2}{\|P_i\|_2^2},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\sqrt{\Omega_0} - \sqrt{\Omega}| &\leq \frac{1}{\|P_1\|_2^2}\left|\|\phi_0(.)\|_2^2 - \|Q_{1\Omega}(.)e^{\frac{ic.}{2}}\|_2^2\right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\|P_1\|_2^2}\left(\delta\|\phi_0(.)\|_2^2 + (1 + \frac{1}{\delta})\|\phi_0(.) - Q_{1\Omega}(.)e^{\frac{ic.}{2}}\|_2^2\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality $\left|\|a\|^2 - \|b\|^2\right| \leq \|a - b\|^2 + 2\|a\|\|a - b\|$ and Young's inequality are used. Using $\|\phi_0(.) - Q_{1\Omega}(.)e^{\frac{ic.}{2}}\|_2^2 \leq \delta^2$ and $\|\phi_0\|_2^2 = \sqrt{\Omega_0}\|P_1\|_2^2$, we have

$$|\sqrt{\Omega_0} - \sqrt{\Omega}| \leq \frac{1}{\|P_1\|_2^2}\left(\delta\sqrt{\Omega_0}\|P_1\|_2^2 + \delta^2 + \delta\right) \leq C(\Omega_0, P_1)\delta$$

where $C(\Omega_0, P_i) = \sqrt{\Omega_0} + 2/\|P_1\|_2^2$. The inequality $|\sqrt{\Omega_0} - \sqrt{\Omega}| \leq C\delta$ implies $|\sqrt[4]{\Omega_0} - \sqrt[4]{\Omega}| \leq D\delta$ for some positive constant D. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

Acknowledgement. Authors would like to thank Alp Eden for helpful discussions at the beginning of this study.

References

1. Y.C. Ma, The resonant interaction among long and short waves, *Wave Motion* **3**, 257-267 (1981).

2. A.D.D. Craik, *Wave interactions and fluid flows*, Cambridge University Press, London (1985).

3. S. Erbay, Nonlinear interaction between long and short waves in a generalized elastic solid, *Chaos Solitons Fractals* **11**, 1789-1798 (2000).

4. H. Borluk and S. Erbay, Existence of solitary waves for three coupled long wave-short wave interaction equations, (submitted).

5. V.D. Djordjevic and L.G. Redekopp, On two-dimensional packets of capillary- gravity waves, *J. Fluid Mech.* **79**, 703-714 (1977).

6. R.H.J. Grimshaw, The modulation of an internal gravity-wave packet, and the resonance with the mean motion, *Stud. Appl. Math.* **56**, 241-266 (1977).

7. PH. Laurençot, On a nonlinear Schrödinger equation arising in the theory of water waves, *Nonlinear Anal.* **24**, 509-527 (1995).

8. T.B. Benjamin, F.R.S., The stability of solitary waves, *Proc. Roy. Soc. London, Ser. A* **328**, 153-183 (1972).

9. M.I. Weinstein, Lyapunov stability of ground states of nonlinear dispersive evolution equations, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **39**, 51-68 (1986).

10. T. Cazenave and P.L. Lions, Orbital stability of standing waves for some nonlinear Schrödinger equations, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **85**, 549-561 (1982).

11. M. Tsutsumi and S. Hatano, Well-posedness of the Cauchy problem for the long wave-short wave resonance equations, *Nonlinear Anal.* **22**, 155-171 (1994).

12. J. Ginibre and Y. Tsutsumi, On the Cauchy problem for the Zakharov system, *J. Funct. Anal.* **151**, 384-436 (1997).

13. A. Eden, G. Muslu and H. Borluk, Existence and uniqueness theorems for the long wave - short waves interaction equations, *18th National Mathematics Symposium, September 05-08, Istanbul, Turkey* (2005).

14. C.E. Kenig, G. Ponce and L. Vega, Oscillatory integrals and regularity of dispersive equations, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **40**, 33-69 (1991).

15. C.E. Kenig, G. Ponce and L. Vega, Small solutions to nonlinear Schrödinger equations, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* **10**, 255-288 (1993).

16. H. Borluk, G.M. Muslu and H.A. Erbay, A numerical study of the long wave-short wave interaction equations, *Math. Comput. Simulation* **74**, 113-125 (2007).

17. V.B. Sz. Nagy, Über Integralungleichungen zwischen einer Funktion und ihrer Ableitung, *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **10**, 64-74 (1941).

18. M.I. Weinstein, Nonlinear Schrödinger equations and sharp interpolation constants, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **55**, 567-576 (1983).

19. L.A. Maia, E. Montefusco and B. Pelacci, Positive solutions for a weakly coupled nonlinear Schrödinger system, *J. Differential Equations* **229**, 743-767 (2006).

20. D.G.D. Figueiredo and O. Lopes, Solitary waves for some nonlinear Schrödinger systems, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéarie* **25**, 149-161 (2008).

21. J. Bona, On the stability theory of solitary waves, *Proc. Roy. Soc. London, Ser. A* **344**, 363-374 (1975).

22. J.Angulo and J.F.B. Montenegro, Orbital stability of solitary wave solutions for an interaction equation of short and long dispersive waves, *J. Differential Equations* **174**, 181-199 (2001).

23. M.I. Weinstein, Modulational stability of ground states on nonlinear Schrödinger equations, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **16**, 472-491 (1985).

24. J. Angulo, J.L. Bona, F. Linares and M. Scialom, Scaling, stability and singularities for nonlinear, dispersive wave equations: the critical case, *Nonlinearity* **15**, 759-786 (2002).